

RE42-09

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ED 010 230

1-31-67 08 (REV)

A PROPOSAL FOR THE PLANNING OF ONE-WEEK WORKSHOPS IN EVALUATION
RESEARCH FOR STATE AND CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL.
SEASHORE, CHARLES N.

MZ143848 NATIONAL TRAINING LABS., WASHINGTON, D.C.

BR-5-0699

17-OCT-66 OHC-6-65-009

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.09 HC-\$1.12 20P.

*PLANNING, PROGRAM PLANNING, RESOURCE MATERIALS, HUMAN RESOURCES,
TRAINING, EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *STATE AID, FEDERAL LEGISLATION,
EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION, LEGISLATION, *EVALUATION,
*PROGRAM EVALUATION, *ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL, WORKSHOPS, *MEETINGS,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, PUBLIC LAW 89-10

THIS REPORT DESCRIBES THE PROCESS OF PLANNING NINE REGIONAL MEETINGS
FOR PROVIDING EVALUATION RESEARCH TRAINING. GOALS OF THE PLANNING
PROCESS WERE (1) TO FORMULATE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR THE REGIONAL
MEETINGS, (2) TO DEVELOP A TRAINING DESIGN FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THESE
MEETINGS, (3) TO ASSESS AVAILABLE STAFF RESOURCES FOR THESE
MEETINGS, AND (4) TO OUTLINE THE KINDS OF RESOURCES MATERIALS NEEDED
FOR THE MEETINGS. THE REPORT PRESENTS A LISTING OF THE PLANNING
GROUP MEMBERS, PLANNING ISSUES, MAJOR PLANNING ACTIVITIES, THE
SELECTED MEETING DATES AND SITES, AND THREE MODEL DESIGNS DEVELOPED
FOR THE MEETINGS. THE REGIONAL MEETINGS WERE SUBSEQUENTLY HELD UNDER
CONTRACT DE-6-10-209 (ED 010 229), INVOLVING STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION PERSONNEL WHO WERE TRAINED IN PROPOSAL EVALUATION RESEARCH
(AS APPLIED TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965,
PUBLIC LAW 89-10). (JH)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FINAL REPORT

Contract No. OE-6-85-009

A PROPOSAL FOR THE PLANNING OF ONE-WEEK WORKSHOPS
IN EVALUATION RESEARCH
FOR STATE AND CITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL, FINAL REP.

Dr. Charles N. Seashore
Program Director

October 17, 1966

National Training Laboratories
Division of
National Education Association
Washington, D. C.

1. BACKGROUND

The Office of Education requested the submission of this project as a proposal following the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 of P.L. 89-10 in order to provide for the possibility of regional workshops in evaluation research for state department of education personnel. This was a particular concern due to the inclusion in Title I of a stipulation requiring objective assessment of all projects conducted under that Title. The project reported here was for the planning process, which culminated in the submission of a proposal and subsequent funding by the Office of Education for the actual carrying out of these nine regional meetings. (Contract #OE-6-10-209)

II. GOALS

1. To formulate specific goals for the nine regional meetings.
2. To develop plans and training design for conducting nine regional meetings for state department of education personnel.
3. To assess staff resources in vocational education, the Office of Education, the American Educational Research Association, and other behavioral science research and training organizations which could be made available for the meetings.
4. To outline the kinds of resource materials needed for participants in the regional meetings.

III. THE PLANNING GROUP

The design for the planning process included two 2-day meetings in August, 1965, which were separated enough in time to allow for interim work by the nine-person planning group. The members of this planning group were as follows:

Dr. William Asher
Graduate School of Education
Harvard University
(now at School of Education,
University of Pittsburgh)

Dr. Robert Beynon
Research Director
Ohio State Department of Education

Dr. Robert Chin
Human Relations Center
Boston University

Dr. Richard Dershimer
Executive Secretary, American
Educational Research Association
National Education Association

Dr. Nicholas Georgiady
Deputy Superintendent
Michigan State Dept. of Education.

Dr. Michael Giannatteo
Bureau of Research
U.S. Office of Education

Dr. Ray Jongeward
Acting Deputy Director
Division of Adult and Vocational Educ.
U.S. Office of Education
(now at Department of Public Instruction,
Olympia, Washington)

Dr. Helen Nelson
Home Economics Department
Cornell University

Dr. Charles Seashore
Research Director
National Training Laboratories
National Education Association

IV. ISSUES IN PLANNING

The following issues were identified as major decision points in the design of the regional meetings:

1. Length of meeting: three-day or one-week.
2. Assessment of level of research sophistication of participants.
3. Identification of the particular needs of participants in their various state department of education functions.
4. The degree of integration of program with the Office of Education Guidelines.
5. The necessary material needed for support of the project.
6. The timing and location of the programs.
7. The selection of the specific objectives to be met through the regional meetings.

V. MAJOR ACTIVITIES IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

1. A search was made for source materials on evaluation study procedures. These materials formed the basis for a major document which was produced under the grant for the conduct of the meetings and was delivered to the Office of Education March, 1966. The Table of Contents for this set of materials is included below:

A Guide to
Evaluation of Title I
of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Evaluation: Responsibilities and Questions Perspective
What is Evaluation? -- An Overview
Why Describe Objectives Clearly?
How to Clarify Objectives
Criterion Tests
Measuring Student Change
Achievement Tests
Guidelines for Testing Disadvantaged Children
List of Standardized Tests
Publishers of Tests
Glossary of Terms
Developing a Testing Program
Measuring Steps Along the Path
Developing an Evaluation Plan
Preparation of Summary Evaluation Report
APPENDIX
References
Bibliography

2. A flow chart was developed of the probable sequence of activities in the development of a state department of education plan for the utilization of Title I funds.
3. A wide variety of objectives were examined as possible central concerns of the regional meetings. Out of this list the following seven were selected as the major points for emphasis:
 - a. To fully review the evaluation research requirements and opportunities of P.L. 89-10.
 - b. To review basic concepts in evaluation research which will serve as guidelines for state agencies in evaluating local school district proposals.
 - c. To explore possible points of influence whereby state department personnel can upgrade the quality of evaluation research.
 - d. To examine typical research designs that can be utilized in evaluating the major type of programs which will be proposed by local school districts, including different levels of sophistication in design.
 - e. To develop models for utilizing educational research resources in the state to assist local school districts.
 - f. To stimulate planning for long-term research objectives, including the dissemination and utilization of the research.
 - g. To provide a model for conducting clinics by state department personnel for local school district personnel.
4. Lists were prepared for potential resources for staffing the meetings. This was done through the use of the National Training Laboratories network of behavioral scientists, the American Educational Research Association office, and the identification of state department of education personnel who were particularly skilled in evaluation research. The list of all staff members is included in the Appendix to this report which summarizes the results of these meetings.
5. Sample studies were screened to identify the major kinds of projects which would be funded under Title I. These projects fell into four major categories which were used by the staff in planning their specific meetings. The four areas are as follows:
 - a. Curriculum innovation, including new media.
 - b. The addition of personnel to reduce teacher-pupil ratio.
 - c. Enlargement or addition of facilities.
 - d. Enrichment programs such as special courses in reading, mathematics, etc.

VI. SELECTION OF DATES AND SITES FOR MEETINGS

It was decided that in order to make the programs available early enough in the fall so that state department of education people could be of maximum use to local education associations, that the programs would be three days in length, conducted in the month of October, 1965. The sites chosen were the Regional Headquarters of the Office of Education. Five Eastern meetings were held October 17-20, 1965, at Boston, New York, Atlanta, Charlottesville, and Chicago. Four Western meetings were held October 24-27, 1965, at Kansas City, Dallas, Denver, and San Francisco. Each program was designed for approximately 40 participants with four staff representing a balance of training, research, and state department of education resources. A National Training Laboratories member was chosen as the chairman of each staff group. Provision was written into the design for a pre-meeting for the chairmen of the nine regional meetings and a one-day meeting of each staff group prior to their meeting. In addition, data was collected at the end of the first meetings for modification of the design in the second meetings.

VII. DEVELOPMENT OF MODEL DESIGNS

Three model designs were developed for the program with provision made for staff to select those particular units in any design that would be most helpful for the participants in that particular meeting. These three designs appear on pages 2 - 8 of the Appendix.

APPENDIX

REGIONAL MEETINGS IN EVALUATION RESEARCH

Contract No. OR-6-10-209

**Dr. Charles N. Seashore
Program Director**

October 17-20, 1966

and

October 24-27, 1966

The training program reported herein was conducted pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Grantees undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment of the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

**National Training Laboratories
Division of
National Education Association
Washington, D.C.**

I. OBJECTIVES OF THE RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM

This project provided for nine regional meetings for state department of education personnel who were associated with evaluation research sections of proposals from local school districts for funds under P.L. 89-10. These meetings were staffed by four-man teams of consultants in training design, educational research, and state department of education administration. They were designed to meet the following objectives:

1. To fully review the evaluation research requirements and opportunities of P.L. 89-10.
2. To review basic concepts in evaluation research which will serve as guidelines for state agencies in evaluating local school district proposals.
3. To explore possible points of influence whereby state department personnel can upgrade the quality of evaluation research.
4. To examine typical research designs that can be utilized in evaluating the major type of programs which will be proposed by local school districts, including different levels of sophistication in design.
5. To develop models for utilizing educational research resources in the state to assist local school districts.
6. To stimulate planning for long-term research objectives, including the dissemination and utilization of the research.
7. To provide a model for conducting clinics by state department personnel for local school district personnel.

II. PROCEDURES

The urgency of this program in helping state department of education personnel give assistance to local school districts meant that the programs should be held as early in the fall as possible. The five Eastern Region meetings were held in Boston, New York, Charlottesville, Atlanta, and Chicago from October 17 through October 20, 1965, beginning with a Sunday evening meeting and going through Wednesday afternoon. The four Western Region meetings were held in Kansas City, Dallas, Denver, and San Francisco from October 20 through October 24, 1965, with a similar time schedule. A roster of the staff and participants who attended each of these programs is included in Appendix A.

Participants were invited following an invitation from the U.S. Office of Education to the state departments of education which was asked to nominate four to six persons to attend the program. In some cases, local school district personnel were included as well as state department of education representatives.

III. DESIGN OF THE PROGRAM

The task of designing the programs was divided between a planning group representing the U.S. Office of Education, National Training Laboratories, State Departments of Education, and educational researchers. These preliminary plans were then developed in further detail by the chairmen of each of the nine programs which met prior to the first meetings. Further designing was done by the staff group of four which met one day prior to the meeting.

Emphasis was placed on the utilization of the experiences, problems, materials, and plans of the participant group so that the format of each meeting was flexible enough to be modified as appropriate. However, three alternative designs were developed for each staff to draw upon, and these designs represent the kinds of sessions that were included in the various meetings. Although no two meetings were exactly alike, most of them drew heavily upon Design I with some modifications using techniques outlined in Designs II and III.

A. Design I

Monday A.M. Objective: To move from statement of problem to analysis of forces operating within problem on evaluation.

9:15 Force-field analysis of change forces and restraining forces in evaluation:
within state
within self
state laws
administrative structure

11:00 What issues and forces will our state department have to deal with? (State groups meet separately. No staff present but available to be called into group for consultation).

Monday P.M. Objective: To clarify various levels, purposes and formats of evaluation, up to and including evaluation research and research.

Structure: Large meeting with buzz groups.

Procedure: Present lecturette on concept of levels of evaluation, format, etc. Provide example of research that exemplified the concept, with brief buzz session following.

Do the same for each concept, level of evaluation, research format.

Monday Evening. Objective: To practice and apply concepts of levels of evaluation to a concrete case in cross-state groups. To clarify the acceptable as well as most ideal levels of evaluation research. To give examples of the acceptable as well as most ideal levels of evaluation research.

(Staff meeting in evening after last session. Possibility of one member of each state meeting with staff to review events of the day and to give the staff feedback for future planning).

Tuesday A.M. Objective: To continue the application and analysis of research concepts in concrete situations of differing complexity.

Structure: Four work groups, A, B, C, D, with staff leader.
1½ hours. Each group is given a concrete study, analyze the study in terms of research concepts, evaluation, etc.

The same procedure with a more complex case.

Tuesday P.M.

Each group design a study based upon a common problem presented to the group by the staff. (1½ hours)

Total group comes together and each group presents the study they have designed for total group analysis.

Staff can feed in additional concepts and elaboration of previous concepts where appropriate. (1½ hours)

Tuesday Evening

State groups meet separately, prepare guidelines (time plan), discuss deficiencies and resources in the state, discuss degree of initiative the state desires to take in program.

Wednesday A.M.

Each group reports to total group the previous night's discussion and conclusions.

Total group discusses future programming, aspirations, lifting of sights.

Total group discusses how to achieve goals, disseminate information to local districts, use consultants, communicate with each other.

Small state groups meet to discuss re-model of plan, goals, changed attitudes, etc.

Wednesday P.M.

Report of state group
Discussion of broad goals of education
Evaluation of workshop

B. Design II

Monday A.M. and P.M.

Purpose: To increase awareness of various levels of research design sophistication.

Structure: Presenter (staff); buzz groups by states preceding or following each topic.

Topics:

1. Uses of single vs. multiple measures
2. Plans for data collection (a la Campbell-Stanley)
3. Simple vs. complex data analyses
4. Problems in measuring change*
5. Problems of reliability, validity, and bias
6. Relation of choice of measure to subject group and purposes of research
7. Problems of sampling and randomization

Presentation of Presage - Process - Product Model**

Examples of complex designs from which simple comparisons would have led to inappropriate conclusions. (Buzz first)

* Lord, F., Elementary Models for Measuring Change. in Harris, C.W. (Ed.) Problems in Measuring Change, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963, opening pp.

**Mitzel, H. E. (title like Teacher Effectiveness Research) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, McMillan, 1960 (?)

Monday Evening

Purpose: To develop awareness of whether an objective is stated in sufficiently behavioral fashion to be testable.*

Structure: Staff presenter followed by work groups across states

Topics:

1. Group work to identify as wide a variety of educational goals as possible.
2. Presentation: Statement of educational goals in behavioral terms.**
3. Group work to convert as many goals as possible into behavioral terms, and identify those which cannot be made behavioral.

* Meger, (title like: Developing Behavioral Objectives), reference to be supplied.

** Example: Make "faster good citizenship" behavioral.

Tuesday Morning:

Purpose: To examine the uses of evaluation research data.

Structure: Presenter (staff) followed by cross-state work groups.

Presenter: Concept of feedback from research as a basis for evaluating program changes.

Work groups: Identify possible situations in which research feedback might help settle practical problems.

Break

Purpose: To present Force Field Analysis as a model for identifying forces supporting and restraining change.

Structure: Staff Presenter lecture and demonstration.

Topic: Force Field Analysis

Tuesday Afternoon:

Purpose: To identify forces which support or restrain the conduct of evaluation research and/or the use of feedback from it.

Structure: Work groups by state.

Topic: Force Field Analysis of home state.

Report to total group for cross fertilization.

Tuesday Evening:

Purpose: To clarify possible roles of the State Department in implementing the law.

Structure: A role play in state groups, followed by small group discussion and report back to total group.

Topic: Role play of state department representative, consulting with local school district representative, followed by small group discussion, reported to total group.

Questions: What possible roles is it appropriate for a state department to play in:

- a. dissemination of research results
- b. fastening use of feedback from evaluation research
- c. increasing level of sophistication of research
- d. helping local districts relate past research to their own research plans.

Wednesday Morning:

Purpose: To apply clinic learnings to evaluation of research proposals.

Structure: Triads: representative of local school district, representative of state department, and observer.
Roles Rotate.
Staff floats for consultation.

Topics: Presentation of research plan by school district representative, consultation by state department representative.
Analysis of: A research presentation
A consultation process.

Break

Purpose:* To identify possible changing rates of state department re: (a) local school districts; (b) Federal Government in relation to other aspects of state department function affected by the Education Bill.

Structure:* State work groups, floating staff, report to total group.

Purpose: To provide opportunities for discussion of problems of special interest.

Structure: Discussion groups led by staff or participants with special skill - based on survey of participants.

*** Alternate Activities**

Wednesday Afternoon:

Purpose: Identify points of influence on the time-line of application development and processing at which state department may effect change.

Structure: State work groups; floating staff; report to total group.

Topic: As indicated.

Purpose: Evaluate Clinic

Structure: State work groups; report to total group.

Topics: Implications of clinic for state department functions in relation to local districts.

What of clinic was relevant or useful; what was not?

C. Design III

Monday Morning:

Objective: To develop some perspectives on evaluation

Structure: Staff presentation -

- (a) Levels of sophistication in research
- (b) Identification of decisions left to the State

Participants in State groups discuss:

- (a) Forces affecting level of activity
- (b) State goals relative to evaluation

Recorders introduce group - Report back on 2a and b

Two staff members record forces and goals on newsprint.

Monday Afternoon: Continuation of morning program.

Four cross-state work groups, A, B, C, D, using "School Programs for the Disadvantaged."

- (a) Select one proposal and as a team try to: delineate goals of an evaluation design for that proposal and identify and expand on means for carrying out the evaluation. (Each staff member will be a resource to a group.)

Monday Evening: Continuation of afternoon program.

Afternoon work groups report to whole group.

- (a) Group A will particularly note presentation of Group B; Group B note C; Group C note D; Group D note A.

Buzz groups on critique of presentations of group noted.

Critique groups report back.

Staff having conferred during buzz groups will report on problems encountered in evaluative experiences of the groups.

Tuesday Morning:

Objective: To move from program purpose to measurement.

Structure: Four cross-state work groups select projects from same manual or from proposed projects from Congressional hearing report. Groups will try to identify concepts inherent in the selected project (e.g. citizenship, reading level, self-concept, occupational goals.)

Participants will be asked to identify concepts inherent in the selected project and to relate these concepts to the concepts of citizenship, reading level, self-concept, and occupational goals. The concepts will be related to the concepts of citizenship, reading level, self-concept, and occupational goals.

Tuesday Afternoon:

Using proposals or abstracts of research design, the four cross-state work groups will review such proposals and offer a critique of

- (a) concepts identified,
- (b) the means used to measure the concepts,
- (c) the usefulness of the projects.

What does it add to our knowledge?

Tuesday Evening:

Return to state groups.

- (a) Purpose of the discussion is to identify criteria to be used in assessing research proposals.
- (b) Staff will be available for resource help.

Wednesday Morning:

Objective: To develop a plan of action for our states.

Structure: State groups, using time-line sheet, develop a state plan.

Cross-state consultation in pairs to refine further lines of direction and to check out time-line plans.

Wednesday Afternoon:

Group together to discuss human values in an evaluation program. Buzz groups to facilitate presentation and discussion.

New issues in the Federal-State-Local front.
Secular - secret. Public - private. Evaluation of import of this money on these relationships.

Particular emphasis was placed on the understanding of the Guidelines from the U.S. Office of Education which were in tentative draft at the time of the meetings. A representative of the Office of Education also attended a part of each meeting and assisted in clarifying the nature of the evaluation requirements of Title I of P.L. 89-10 and also clarified the nature of the educational research training program being developed by the Office of Education.

The intermediate week between the Eastern meetings and the Western meetings made it possible to review the designs and outcomes of the first five programs and make some modifications in the designs for the later meetings.

IV. WRITTEN PRODUCTS

A major effort was made to summarize the kinds of material which would be helpful for state department of education personnel, and this document, entitled "A guide to Evaluation of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," authored by Lawrence E. Schlesinger, was delivered.

to the Office of Education March 31, 1966. It was planned that this be edited and disseminated to all local school districts in the country. In addition, the design of each meeting served as a model which each participant could take back home in working with groups in his state.

V. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

At the end of each meeting a post-meeting reaction sheet was distributed, and the results are fairly consistent across all of the different programs. Each objective was listed and scored on a 5-point scale, with 1 meaning that the objective was ignored, overlooked, or met to a minimum degree, and 5 meaning that the objective was covered completely to their satisfaction. The mean scores across the nine programs are given below each of the objectives, as follows:

1. To fully review the evaluation research requirements and opportunities of P.L. 89-10.
Mean score: 3.52
2. To review basic concepts in evaluation research which will serve as guidelines for state agencies in evaluating local school district proposals.
Mean score: 3.62
3. To explore possible points of influence whereby state department personnel can upgrade the quality of evaluation research.
Mean score: 3.37
4. To examine typical research designs that can be utilized in evaluating the major type of programs which will be proposed by local school districts, including different levels of sophistication in design.
Mean score: 3.90
5. To develop models for utilizing educational research resources in the state to assist local school districts.
Mean score: 2.91
6. To stimulate planning for long-term research objectives, including the dissemination and utilization of the research.
Mean score: 3.21
7. To provide a model for conducting clinics by state department personnel for local school district personnel.
Mean score: 3.36

In addition to these reactions, three areas were identified by both staff and participants as problems that were faced at the meetings:

1. Participants' expectations.

The staff indicated that most participants were uncertain as to the purposes of the meetings. A number of them felt Title IV of P.L. 89-10 was the proposed subject; others thought it was to be a workshop on how to write proposals; and many said they would have liked some preliminary

material beforehand. A number of the participants in the Eastern meetings had just returned from the administrative conference in Atlanta and thought the evaluation meetings would be a continuation of the same. Several of the staff felt this belief was responsible for an initial low level of interest.

2. Importance of evaluation research.

Several participants felt the evaluation requirements of proposals would serve as a barrier to distributing needed funds, and expressed a greater interest in learning the do's and don't's of writing evaluation sections of proposals rather than exploring the rationale and techniques of evaluation research.

3. Resistance to programs.

A number of staff teams discerned some degree of resistance to their initial efforts on evaluation research. They discovered many participants had some important feelings which had to be dealt with before evaluation designs could be realistically considered. A number of state department personnel felt they could be in the position of serving a holding action as they realized that local proposals would not meet the evaluation requirements but that local public opinion would be adamant in its demand for X number of dollars as computed from the formula in the Bill. This led some to feel they might have to approve every proposal which came to their attention. Others felt the consideration of state guidelines on evaluation would be premature as they expected a detailed pre-emptive statement from Washington.

VI. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This training program indicated the feasibility of mounting short-term meetings in a short space of time, including the interest and participation of professionals in the field of educational research. The evaluation data indicate that some progress was made towards reaching the objectives of the program despite a great deal of unclarity about the evaluation requirements, the role of state department of education personnel in administering the provisions of P.L. 89-10, and the tentative nature of the guidelines available from the U.S. Office of Education. It remains quite clear, however, that this population of people are in need of a much more substantial program in research design before achieving any sophistication in evaluation research. In the main, their concerns were more administrative than substantive, and the decision to prepare a major document was an attempt to provide some further resources which could be referred to for guidance in evaluation research where there were only minimal skills in actual conduct of research.

VII. ACCOUNTING OF THE PROJECT TO DATE

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Total Expended</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 1. Personnel | |
| A. National Training Laboratories | |
| Central Office Staff | |
| Dr. Charles Seashore, Project Director | \$ 3,275.69 |
| Dr. Cyril R. Mill, Assistant Project Director | 1,672.96 |
| Mr. Robert A. Luke, Staff Assistant | 754.87 |
| Miss Carol Jacoby, Project Secretary | 1,376.82 |
| B. Consultant Staff | |
| Staff for Regional Meetings | 16,000.00 |
| Additional Consultation, Robert Chin | 100.00 |
| Writing of Resource Book, Dr. Lawrence Schlesinger | 4,600.00 |
| 2. Supplies and Material | |
| A. Office and Regional Meetings Supplies | 911.00 |
| B. Communications | 966.68 |
| C. Miscellaneous | 781.89 |
| 3. Services | |
| A. Duplicating | 446.78 |
| B. Postage and Express | 337.66 |
| 4. Travel | |
| A. National Training Laboratories | |
| Central Office Staff | 443.82 |
| Staff for Regional Meetings | 2,595.12 |
| Participants at Meetings | 15,944.62 |
| Consultant - Dr. Lawrence Schlesinger | 23.40 |
| 5. Per Diem | |
| A. National Training Laboratories | |
| Central Office Staff | 9.75 |
| Staff for Regional Meetings | 2,634.85 |
| Participants at Meetings | 14,771.63 |
| | TOTAL - Direct Costs |
| | \$ 67,647.64 |
| 6. Overhead - 8% of Direct Costs | <u>5,411.80</u> |
| | GRAND TOTAL |
| | \$ 73,059.34 |

Amount of Grant Funds Received: \$ 73,059.34

Note: The above amounts were billed to the U.S. Office of Education in detail by monthly statements.

APPENDIX A

**Roster of Participants and Staff
(listed by State)
Eastern Regions
October 17-20, 1965**

Region I - Boston, Massachusetts

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| <u>Connecticut</u> | |
| Wallace Roby | \$ 64.80 |
| <u>Maine</u> | |
| Philip A. Ammas | 48.00 |
| Joseph J. Devitt | 94.60 |
| Stanley L. Freeman, Jr. | 98.40 |
| Philip C. Libby | 99.15 |
| Ronald Logan | 84.00 |
| William T. Logan | -0- |
| Carroll R. McGary | 64.60 |
| <u>Massachusetts</u> | |
| Richard P. Charlton | 32.00 |
| Joseph E. Killory | 56.00 |
| Frederick A. Small | 40.00 |
| Everett G. Thistle | 40.60 |
| John Torosian | 66.80 |
| <u>New Hampshire</u> | |
| Paul R. Fillion | 54.00 |
| Lewis F. Foote | 65.30 |
| <u>Rhode Island</u> | |
| Edward J. Condon | 56.00 |
| Edward T. Costa | 67.50 |
| Arthur T. Geoghegan | 48.80 |
| Charles P. Hollstein | 52.10 |
| <u>Vermont</u> | |
| Richard A. Dowd | 96.00 |
| Walter D. Gallagher | 108.00 |
| Raymond B. Magwire | 90.20 |
| Karlene V. Russell | 71.90 |
| Sub-total | \$1426.85 |

Region I, continued

| <u>Staff</u> | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Dr. Robert Chin (Chairman) | |
| Human Relations Center | |
| Boston University | |
| Dr. James M. Burke | |
| Educational Consultant | |
| Connecticut Department of Education | |
| Dr. John D. Herzog | |
| Harvard Graduate School of Education | |
| Dr. Donald C. Klein | |
| Human Relations Center | |
| Boston University | |
| <u>Region II -New York, New York</u> | |
| | Amount of Support |
| <u>Delaware</u> | |
| W. Franklin Barr | \$ 60.20 |
| D. Russell Friend | 68.15 |
| Ruth M. Laws | 69.70 |
| Elizabeth C. Lloyd | 66.55 |
| Marian B. Miller | 67.00 |
| W. A. Proctor | 70.98 |
| Howard E. Row | 81.32 |
| Robert B. Rowen | -0- |
| Dustin W. Wilson, Jr. | 66.82 |

Region II -New York, New York

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| | |
| <u>Delaware</u> | |
| W. Franklin Barr | \$ 60.20 |
| D. Russell Friend | 68.15 |
| Ruth M. Laws | 69.70 |
| Elizabeth C. Lloyd | 66.55 |
| Marian B. Miller | 67.00 |
| W. A. Proctor | 70.98 |
| Howard E. Row | 81.32 |
| Robert B. Rowen | -0- |
| Dustin W. Wilson, Jr. | 66.82 |
| | |
| | |
| <u>New Jersey</u> | |
| Minerva F. Desing | 64.00 |
| Louis A. Dughi | 32.40 |
| W. Frank Johnson | 64.40 |
| Sam Matarazzo | 34.40 |
| Ellmore H. Slaybaugh | 65.35 |

Region II, New Jersey, continued

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|-----------------|------------------------------|
| Harold K. Smith | \$ 55.00 |
| Carl W. Swanson | 65.48 |
| David Tankel | 47.98 |
| Anne R. Tantum | 37.48 |

New York

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Sigmund Abeles | 55.50 |
| James Cabeceiras | 106.30 |
| Louis T. DiZorenzo | 48.00 |
| Eileen M. Kelly | 87.80 |
| Lon Kleinman | -0- |
| Leslie D. McLean | -0- |
| Egon Mermelstein | 59.50 |
| Irving Rothchild | 55.53 |
| Gerald H. Wohlfeld | 45.50 |

Pennsylvania

| | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| Edwin B. Carskadon | 110.70 |
| Henry J. Gatski | 103.69 |
| John E. Koscloski | 106.18 |
| Mervin E. Manning | 90.48 |
| Guy Minadeo | 124.45 |
| Walbert Murphy | 90.35 |
| Sub-total | \$1957.86 |

Staff

Dr. Edmund J. Amidon (Chairman)

Group Dynamics Center

Temple University

Dr. Wesley Dorn

Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education

Dr. Robert Hayes

Bureau of Research

Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction

Dr. Donald Medley

Educational Testing Service

Region III, Charlottesville, Virginia

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|--|------------------------------|
|--|------------------------------|

\$

Kentucky

| | |
|------------------|--------|
| Eugene Camic | 140.34 |
| Eddie W. Belcher | 136.45 |
| James C. Farmer | 135.40 |
| Burtis Franklin | 120.30 |
| W. R. McNeill | -0- |
| Newman Walker | 167.90 |

Maryland

| | |
|------------------------|-------|
| J. Edward Andrews, Jr. | 56.00 |
| Mae Graham | 40.00 |
| James W. Jacobs | 96.00 |
| Richard W. McKay | 40.00 |
| Thomas W. Pyles | 56.00 |

North Carolina

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Joseph L. Cashwell | 100.80 |
| Thelma L. Cumbo | 56.00 |
| Myrtle M. Haigwood | 56.00 |
| Woodrow B. Sugg | 100.80 |
| Bert W. Westbrook | 56.00 |

Puerto Rico

| | |
|--------------------------|--------|
| Charles O. Hamill | 206.50 |
| Eduardo J. Rivera-Medina | 198.00 |

Virgin Islands

| | |
|------------------|--------|
| Huldah A. Joseph | 241.60 |
|------------------|--------|

Virginia

| | |
|------------------------|-------|
| Oren R. Counts | 81.00 |
| Frank H. Elliott | 56.00 |
| Clarence L. Kent | 56.00 |
| William C. Overton | 84.50 |
| Robert W. Parlier | -0- |
| George G. Tankard, Jr. | 51.10 |
| Alton L. Taylor | 71.00 |
| James W. Tyler | 71.00 |

West Virginia

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Lawrence G. Derthick, Jr. | 103.85 |
| Daniel B. Taylor | 119.10 |

Sub-total

\$2562.24

Region III, continued

Staff

Dr. Stuart Gilbreath (Chairman)
Testing & Counseling Center
University of Cincinnati

Dr. Robert P. Beynon
Division of Research
Ohio Department of Education

Dr. Egon Guba
Bureau of Educational Research and
Service
Ohio State University

Dr. Lawrence E. Schlesinger
George Washington University

Region IV-Atlanta, Georgia

Amount of
Support

Alabama

| | |
|----------------------|----------|
| J. Clyde Blair | \$ 87.00 |
| J. H. Boockholdt | 91.00 |
| Erline Curlee | 92.00 |
| W. Morrisen McCall's | 89.70 |
| Clifton Nash | 93.00 |
| Annie M. Turner | 96.40 |

Arizona

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Elizabeth Tescott | 256.80 |
|-------------------|--------|

Florida

| | |
|----------------------|--------|
| C. N. Fagan, Jr. | 112.14 |
| Rodney P. Smith, Jr. | 101.00 |
| I. M. Wade | 95.69 |

Georgia

| | |
|--------------------|--------|
| Jeff L. Cain | 69.80 |
| R. C. Beemon | 4.00 |
| Harry L. Bowman | -0- |
| C. H. Huff | 54.40 |
| Sam S. Jossey | 101.00 |
| John E. Robinson | 110.28 |
| Daughtry L. Thomas | 56.00 |

Region IV, continued

Amount of
Support

Kentucky

| | |
|-------------------|-----------|
| D. C. Anderson | \$ 113.89 |
| Stella A. Edwards | 117.44 |
| Claude A. Taylor | 113.90 |
| Fred. D. Williams | 129.42 |

Mississippi

| | |
|---------------------|--------|
| Ralph Brewer | 121.70 |
| W. L. Hearn | 90.10 |
| Ruby M. Thompson | 122.20 |
| A. G. Shepherd, Jr. | 121.20 |

South Carolina

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Sidney B. Cooper | 92.20 |
| Harris A. Marshall | 90.43 |
| Donald C. Pearce | 91.70 |
| William B. Royster | 88.23 |

Tennessee

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| John R. Cox | -0- |
| E. B. Eller | -0- |
| Vernon L. Johnson | 100.00 |
| John R. Lovegrove | -0- |
| Willis C. Nowell | 98.60 |

Sub-total

\$3001.22

Staff

Dr. Robert S. Soar (Chairman)
Group Dynamics Center
Temple University

Dr. Homer C. Cooper
Social Science Research Center
University of Georgia

Dr. Robert Newton
Pre-School Child Study Research
Project

Dr. Paul Penningroth
Southern Regional Education Board

Region V, Chicago, Illinois

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> | | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|---------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Illinois | | South Dakota | |
| Frank Christensen | \$ 62.00 | Olive S. Berg | \$ 166.80 |
| Thomas J. Denny | 97.00 | L. P. Duenwald | 154.80 |
| Ralph E. Lundgren | 43.00 | Norris M. Paulson | 179.35 |
| Charles J. Miller | 43.20 | E. W. Skarda | 145.25 |
| Earl J. Schuur | 52.42 | | |
| Denson Sprouse | 79.70 | Wisconsin | |
| Donald Thomas | 35.20 | William H. Ashbaugh | 74.00 |
| George Topping | 48.00 | Archie A. Buchmiller | 58.90 |
| Indiana | | John J. Cook | 91.00 |
| Earl L. Grove | 87.93 | Dale O. Irwin | 76.00 |
| Charles D. Hopkins | 97.93 | Richard R. Roth | 93.10 |
| K. Forbis Jordan | 83.40 | | ----- |
| Aaron T. Lindley | 56.00 | Sub-total | \$3925.64 |
| James H. McElhinney | 98.00 | Staff | |
| Don C. Patton | 93.80 | Dr. Mildred Peters (Chairman) Educational Guidance & Counseling Wayne State University | |
| Edgar B. Smith | 96.98 | Dr. John Hough College of Education Ohio State University | |
| Michigan | | Dr. Fred Lighthall Department of Education University of Chicago | |
| Donald R. Beaton | 96.20 | Dr. Bertram B. Mazia Department of Education University of Chicago | |
| Allen L. Bernstein | 79.95 | | |
| Louis Kocsis | 96.20 | | |
| Paul N. Lehto | 96.90 | | |
| Leon S. Waskin | 94.90 | | |
| Minnesota | | | |
| John E. Bicknell | 114.70 | | |
| Farley D. Bright | 114.20 | | |
| Sigurd J. Ode | 114.70 | | |
| Nebraska | | | |
| C. Edward Cavert | 140.10 | | |
| Gustave R. Lieske | 137.80 | | |
| Glen E. Shafer | 136.00 | | |
| Leonard Skov | 137.80 | | |
| James E. Sorensen | 136.80 | | |
| Ohio | | | |
| Clifford B. Elliott | 104.70 | | |
| Jonn A. Marrah | 104.70 | | |
| Russell A. Working | 106.23 | | |

Western Regions
October 24-27, 1965

Region VI, Kansas City, Missouri

Amount of

Support

Luncheons for staff and participants, paid for by National Training Laboratories, and deducted from their per diem.

\$ 193.19

Iowa

| | |
|----------------------|--------|
| William M. Baley | 86.15 |
| James E. Bowman | 85.46 |
| Richard D. Brooks | 83.95 |
| Ralph Van Dusseldorp | 103.45 |
| Giles J. Smith | 86.05 |

Kansas

| | |
|--------------------|-------|
| G. L. Cleland | 56.55 |
| T. William Goodwin | 63.95 |
| James E. Marshall | 65.45 |
| Henry A. Parker | 64.45 |
| Charles B. Watkins | 70.75 |
| Lyle Welch | 48.95 |

Kentucky

| | |
|-----------------|--------|
| Sidney Simandle | 124.65 |
|-----------------|--------|

Minnesota

| | |
|------------------|--------|
| Reynold Erickson | 104.55 |
| G. Dean Miller | 115.05 |
| Gordon Miniclier | 101.05 |

Missouri

| | |
|---------------------|-------|
| Charles E. Blackman | 68.25 |
| Edmund L. Downey | 56.45 |
| David Latimer | 91.47 |
| John T. Lawrence | 68.15 |
| Lewis W. Ogle | 59.09 |
| Donald R. Shire | 65.95 |

North Dakota

| | |
|------------------|--------|
| Glenn R. Dolan | 164.45 |
| Kieran L. Dooley | 173.05 |

Region VI, continued

Amount of

Support

Rhode Island

| | |
|------------------|-----------|
| Steward R. Essex | \$ 204.45 |
| <u>Sub-total</u> | \$2404.96 |

Staff

Dr. J. Weldon Moffitt (Chairman)
Brigham Young University

Dr. Clyde Baer
Division of Research & Development
School District of Kansas City

Dr. Robert P. Beynon
Division of Research
Ohio Department of Education

Dr. Max R. Goodson
Research & Development Center
University of Wisconsin

Region VII, Dallas, Texas

Arkansas

| | |
|------------------|--------|
| Andy F. Aldridge | 107.60 |
| Ray E. Bruce | 122.88 |
| Hugh Lovett | 108.60 |
| LeRoy Pennington | 108.60 |
| Ralph B. Riley | 105.00 |
| Leon L. Wilson | 109.60 |

Canal Zone

| | |
|---------------------|--------|
| Ellis L. Fawcett | 344.60 |
| William C. Garber | 344.60 |
| Carl F. Maedl | 344.60 |
| David A. Speir, Jr. | 344.60 |
| Clyde A. Willman | 344.60 |

Region VII, continued

Louisiana

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Joe W. Campbell | \$ 120.36 |
| George Feyerabend | 136.41 |
| John E. Fitzpatrick | 115.60 |
| Charles R. Jarreau | 154.75 |
| Murray I. Jones | 124.36 |
| Donald L. Kennedy | 79.40 |
| Louis B. Roth, Jr. | 133.15 |
| Robert E. Wall | 144.68 |

New Mexico

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| F. E. Atkinson | 139.80 |
| Henry B. Hammer | 133.65 |
| Robert J. Myers | 133.40 |
| Robert A. Swanson | 129.90 |
| Calloway Taulbee | 133.15 |

Oklahoma

| | |
|---------------------|--------|
| Merle Collins | 100.00 |
| John C. Egermeier | 118.20 |
| Gerald D. Kidd | 56.00 |
| Paul I. McCloud | 105.00 |
| Tommy Sullivan | 106.50 |
| James H. Petree | 56.00 |
| J. F. Thompson | 100.00 |
| Maurice P. Walraven | 100.00 |

Texas

| | |
|---------------------|--------|
| Julian Biggers | 56.00 |
| D. Frank Clark | 98.20 |
| H. Bennett Cooksey | 82.00 |
| John R. Guemple | 56.00 |
| James F. Jeffrey | 96.00 |
| William T. Kinniell | 96.00 |
| Guy B. McNeil | 98.20 |
| Charles W. Nix | 56.00 |
| H. E. Phillips | 58.65 |
| Tom W. Porter | 63.20 |
| Richard D. Slater | 104.20 |
| Billy L. Turney | 64.60 |

Region VII, continued

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|----------------------|------------------------------|
| | <u>Washington, D.C.</u> |
| Mildred P. Cooper | \$ 230.50 |
| Joseph M. Carroll | 236.55 |
| Elizabeth V. Lindsay | 228.50 |
| Harry B. Rutherford | 228.50 |
| | ----- |

Sub-total \$6602.69

Staff

Dr. Marie Hughes
College of Education
University of Arizona

Dr. Elbert D. Brooks
Tucson Public Schools

Dr. Frances Hine
Office of Los Angeles County
Supervisor of Schools

Dr. Kenneth MacIntyre
Department of Education
University of Texas

Region VIII, Denver, Colorado

Colorado

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Kenneth B. Ashcraft | -0- |
| Paul G. Bethke | -0- |
| Edward A. Brainard | 11.79 |
| Lewis R. Crum | -0- |
| Richard M. Fawley | 24.00 |
| John L. Hayman, Jr. | 24.00 |
| Herbert H. Hughes | 26.00 |
| Gerald F. Ulrich | 21.00 |
| Arthur R. Olson | 73.00 |
| Ward M. Vining | 18.00 |
| Russell B. Vlaanderer | -0- |

Region VIII, continued

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| <u>Idaho</u> | |
| D. H. Beary | \$ 155.00 |
| Harold T. Farley | 154.50 |
| Maynard G. Lewis | 153.50 |
| Camden B. Meyer | 158.15 |
| Robert E. Neal | 153.50 |
| Andrew L. Smith | 197.00 |
| <u>Kansas</u> | |
| Ralph A. Forsythe | 16.75 |
| <u>Montana</u> | |
| George R. Bandy | 169.70 |
| Shelby O. Bewley | 194.24 |
| Wayne Grames | 164.30 |
| Marie Mastorovich | 164.30 |
| Paul T. O'Hara | 128.66 |
| Robert C. Roberts | 167.60 |
| <u>Utah</u> | |
| Maurice C. Barnett | 116.05 |
| Harry P. Bluhm | 115.80 |
| Walter R. Borg | 129.20 |
| James W. Dunn | 127.80 |
| Rulon R. Garfield | 122.80 |
| Le Mora L. Losee | 120.50 |
| Elwin Nielsen | 113.30 |
| Quentin E. Utley | 116.30 |
| Ray D. Warner | 129.20 |
| <u>Wyoming</u> | |
| Harold R. Goff | 81.65 |
| Paul G. Graves | 74.00 |
| Blaine Ronne | 100.00 |
| Ruth Schmitt | 97.50 |
| Albert B. Schultz | 107.40 |
| Dean P. Talagan | 60.40 |
| Sidney C. Werner | 81.65 |
| <u>Sub-total</u> | <u>\$3564.54</u> |
| <u>Staff</u> | |

Dr. Norman N. Paris (Chairman)
 Testing & Counseling Center
 University of Cincinnati

Region VIII, continued

| |
|---|
| Dr. Phillip Daniels Brigham Young University |
| Dr. Nicholas P. Georgiady Michigan Department of Public Instruction |
| Dr. Kenneth Hopkins School of Education University of Colorado |

Region IX - San Francisco, California

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| <u>Alaska</u> | |
| Nathaniel H. Cole | \$ 292.90 |
| Jeff C. Jeffers | 295.40 |
| Winfred D. Lande | 276.70 |
| William R. Marsh | 276.70 |
| Robert L. Thomas | 292.50 |
| <u>Arizona</u> | |
| W. Maurice Gemmell | 144.45 |
| Ralph Goitia | 133.60 |
| Herschel Hooper | 145.95 |
| Charles R. McDowell | 133.60 |
| Fred L. Schmitt | 155.35 |
| <u>California</u> | |
| Ray L. Sweigert, Jr. | 83.75 |
| <u>Hawaii</u> | |
| Ronald L. Johnson | 266.20 |
| Clarence N. Masumotoya | 267.30 |
| <u>Idaho</u> | |
| Ross E. Barney | 131.50 |
| <u>Nevada</u> | |
| John R. Gamble | 82.95 |
| Robert L. Lloyd, Jr. | 82.95 |
| Donald K. Perry | 82.95 |
| Gerald R. Shelby | 84.35 |
| Byron F. Stetler | 88.25 |

Region IX, continued

| | <u>Amount of Support</u> |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| <u>Oregon</u> | \$ |
| Milt R. Baum | 131.00 |
| Willard Bear | 131.00 |
| Maynard L. Christensen | 131.00 |
| James B. Ellingson | 123.00 |
| Austin E. Haddock | 146.40 |
| Luis E. Morales | 136.60 |

Washington

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Marjorie Mottishaw Anderson | 142.90 |
| James W. Hardie | 112.67 |
| Ernest G. Kramer | 153.20 |
| Alan W. Metcalf | 142.90 |
| Harold G. Smith | 142.90 |
| <hr/> | |
| <u>Sub-total</u> | \$ 4655.37 |

Staff

Dr. Peter Lenrow (Chairman)
University of California

Dr. Jay E. Jongeward
Washington Department of Public
Instruction

Dr. Mary D. Martin
Office of Los Angeles County Super-
visor of Schools

Dr. Arthur P. Coladarci
Stanford University

TOTAL AMOUNT OF SUPPORT

\$30,101.37

APPENDIX B

**A GUIDE TO
EVALUATION OF TITLE I
of the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
of 1965**

by
LAWRENCE E. SCHLESINGER, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation: Responsibilities and Questions

Perspective

What is Evaluation? -- An Overview

Why Describe Objectives Clearly?

How to Clarify Objectives

Criterion Tests

Measuring Student Change

Achievement Tests

Guidelines for Testing Disadvantaged Children

List of Standardized Tests

Publishers of Tests

Glossary of Terms

Developing a Testing Program

Measuring Steps Along the Path

Developing an Evaluation Plan

Preparation of Summary Evaluation Report

APPENDIX

References

Bibliography